

REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on June 28, 2006.

Claims 9 and 10 are amended. No claims are canceled or added. As a result, claims 2-17 and 19-28 remain pending in this application.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant believes that claims 9-13, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Reservation of the Right to Swear Behind References

Applicant maintains the right to swear behind any references which are cited in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§102(a), 102(e), 103/102(a), and 103/102(e). Statements distinguishing the claimed subject matter over the cited references are not to be interpreted as admissions that the references are prior art.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson (U.S. 6,122,336).

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the reasons presented below.

Claim 9 is amended and recites, among other things, that “at least one first differential transistor pair of the plurality of differential transistor pairs is responsive to a first clock phase of the multiple clock phases, and wherein at least one second differential transistor pair of the plurality of differential transistor pairs is responsive to a second clock phase of the multiple clock phases”. Applicant is unable to find in Anderson everything recited in claim 9. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Anderson “at least one first differential transistor pair of

the plurality of differential transistor pairs is responsive to a first clock phase of the multiple clock phases, and wherein at least one second differential transistor pair of the plurality of differential transistor pairs is responsive to a second clock phase of the multiple clock phases". Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 9.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-8, 14-15, and 19-28 were allowed. Applicant acknowledges the allowance of claims 2-8, 14-15, and 19-28.

Claims 10-13 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 USC § 112 set forth in the Office Action. Claim 10 is rewritten in independent form. The rewriting does not alter the scope of claim 10. Thus, claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-13 are now in conditional for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6969) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPHEN R. MOONEY ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 373-6969

Date 28 September 2006

By 

Viet V. Tong

Reg. No. 45,416

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 28th day of September 2006.

Amy Moriarty
Name


Signature